

Remarks/Arguments

The Examiner is thanked for the careful review of this Application. Claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-16, 19, 23, 25, 35-50 are pending after entry of the present Amendment.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

The Office has rejected claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-16, 19, 23, 25, 35-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,615,264 to Stoltz et al. (Stoltz). For at least the followings reasons, Stoltz fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, as defined in independent claims 1, 12, 23 and 35.

The cited portions of Stoltz fail to teach each and every feature of Applicants' claimed invention. As currently amended, Applicants have further defined the claimed invention to include authenticating said user implementing a second token, the authenticating using the second token being converted to a same authentication for said user as the authenticated token created from the first token. Support is found in the as-filed application and no new matter has been added.

Applicants disagree with the interpretation of Stoltz's alleged authenticated token found in the Office Action mailed January 10, 2007. The Office maintains that Stoltz teaches the use of an authenticated token and particularly points to col. 19 lines 19-35. Applicants believe that the cited portion of Stoltz details an authentication process and does not disclose the claimed invention because information in the user's authentication database is not the same as the claimed authenticated token.

Applicants believe the claimed invention adds features not disclosed in Stoltz because Stoltz does not describe authenticating, using the second token that is converted to a same authentication for the user as the authenticated token created from the first token. Note that using the Office's interpretation of Stoltz, it would be impossible to have the

same authenticated token if a user logged on from two different terminals because the Office asserts that the network address of the network terminal (col. 19, lines 31-35) is part of the authenticated token. Thus, Applicants believe that Stoltz does not teach each and every element of the claimed invention.

Consequently, Stoltz cannot be applied under 35 USC §102(e) alone. Rather, Stoltz can only be cited as art under 35 USC §102(e)/103(c). Note that Stoltz is assigned to Sun Microsystems, the same assignee of the present application and that the inventors of the present application had a duty to assign their invention to Sun Microsystems. Therefore, under 35 §103(c), Stoltz should be removed as a reference against the present application.

Accordingly, the claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-16, 19, 23, 25, and 42-50 are submitted to be patentable over the cited art of record. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that a notice of allowance be issued for the claims. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6911. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP601). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Konrad Chan

Reg. No. 57,857

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Telephone (408) 774-6911
Facsimile (408) 749-6901
Customer No. 32291